

were surprised to learn that the differences have gotten worse.

For example, Zocor, a very commonly prescribed drug for people who have some heart problems or problems with their circulation, Zocor in the United States on average sells for \$85 for a month's supply. In Germany you can buy that drug for \$23.83.

Mr. Speaker, what is interesting about this story is that one of my colleagues came up to me and he saw this chart. He said, I take Zocor. I said how much do you pay for it. He said a copay for a U.S. Congressman for that Zocor is \$30 here in the United States. You can walk in off the street to the Metropolitan Pharmacy in Frankfurt, Germany and pay \$23.83, and the Germans think they are paying too much for prescription drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I am holding in my hand two boxes of Celebrex. They are exactly the same. They come from the same plant. If you bought this box of Celebrex in the United States, you would pay more than double what you pay for the same drug in Germany.

Now, I think Americans are willing to, and I speak on behalf of most Americans, we understand there is a cost to develop these drugs. There is a cost to market these drugs. Unfortunately, there is too much being spent on advertising, but I am not one who says they should not be able to advertise. But I believe Americans ought to have access to world-class drugs at world-market prices. I am asking my colleagues to join me in supporting, and I have another chart that is easier to read, compare London to Athens to the United States. We now have pharmacists from around the world who regularly send us their prices for the drugs.

In almost every case, it is less than half what we pay in the United States. These same five drugs, Lipitor, Nexium, Prevacid, Zoloft, and Zyrtec, those five drugs in London, \$195.95. In Athens, \$231.04; but here in the United States, \$507.96.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to please join me in cosponsoring H.R. 328, the Pharmaceutical Market Access Act of 2005. It is time to make clear that Americans have access to world-class drugs at world-market prices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AIRPORT COMPETITION IN DALLAS-FORT WORTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of a law which has fostered spectacular growth and vitality in my district and throughout all of north Texas. That law, which has become known as the Wright amendment, was passed in 1979 to settle for all time a controversy on how best to achieve robust competitive airline competition in the Dallas-Fort Worth area.

It has worked and continues to work beyond all expectations, but the benefits it has brought can easily be undone. Given all of the turmoil in the airline industry and the limited time for Congress to get important business done, any serious effort to change the current law would be a misuse of our time and resources.

Since the issue has been in the news lately and Members have been approached with very simplistic answers on the surface, compelling arguments about the Wright amendment, I want to put some facts into the RECORD.

In the late 1960s, the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth, at the urgings of the Civil Aeronautics Board, agreed to end the fragmentation of air service in the region and invest in a single regional airport that could serve all of the people in the area. At the time, everyone knew a new airport would not work unless there was an absolute commitment by all parties to consolidate all the service from the various local airports in the area into the new facility, which became known as the Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport.

The two communities and all carriers offering interstate service from the existing airports agreed on this course of action. However, one carrier that at that time offered only interstate service from Dallas' downtown airport, Love Field, refused to do so.

This led to a long and protracted and bitter legal battle between the communities and this carrier, which ultimately resulted in a carefully negotiated compromise. This compromise encompassed into Federal law to preserve it was exactly constructed to reflect the intent of the communities as

well as the desires of the interstate carrier.

Reluctantly, the civic parties agreed to allow the one carrier that had refused to move to the DFW Airport to operate out of Love Field to and from points within Texas or to its four contiguous States. That carrier agreed to the Wright amendment as a way to settle the issue for all time.

Last week, the highly respected global aviation consulting firm, Simat, Helliesen & Eichner, released an omnibus report which predicts devastating consequences to the Dallas-Fort Worth Airport if the Wright amendment were to be repealed. I will submit the report for the RECORD; but it predicts if the Wright amendment is repealed, DFW could lose 204 flights a day, 21 million passengers annually, and slash DFW passenger traffic back to levels seen 20 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, health in the airline industry is dependent on healthy competition between airlines. In contrast, competition between very closely located airports can be destructive. The communities of Dallas and Fort Worth understood this when they agreed to end, or restrict, commercial air traffic to their local airports. DFW was built to accommodate any and all carriers, and over the years it has attracted both network and low-cost carriers.

Just as importantly, by limiting traffic at the neighboring airports, DFW was able to compete among airports and now is the fifth largest airport. Think of it this way. Almost everyone would agree it would improve competition to have 30 airlines competing against each other, but no one would suggest it would be healthy to have 30 airports competing against each other. Just like two major shopping centers will die if located next door to each other, two airports located only 12 miles apart, as are in Dallas, Love Field and DFW will provide two weaker airports.

Let us be perfectly clear. Restriction at Meacham and Love Fields were not put in place to give DFW a jump start. No one said, We will invest billions of dollars in a huge international airport and domestic hub airport until it is successful and then we will undercut the very source of its success by reopening the airports that we closed to make it so. That does not make good business sense.

Mr. Speaker, DFW is what it is today because it is the only airport in the metroplex that passengers can use to fly anywhere in the world. Moreover, it has not achieved the success it has by being anticompetitive. On the contrary, it has always welcomed all comers. DFW currently has gates available and is seeking new airlines.

Love Field was never meant to be a competitor to DFW. In fact, DFW would probably have never been built and the tens of thousands of jobs and the billions of dollars of economic stimulus it has given Dallas-Fort Worth would never have been realized

if Love Field had remained an unrestricted airport. The best proof of that statement is evidenced by the 21 empty gates currently vacant at DFW. Despite any attractive incentives, DFW has been unable to attract new, low-cost tenants because of the discussion of repealing the Wright amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FILNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again it is an honor to address this great House of Representatives. I want to thank not only the Democratic leader but the Democratic leadership for allowing me to be here on their behalf.

Our 30-something Working Group, which the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) put together in the 108th Congress, our focus is to work on issues that are facing not only young Americans but Americans in general. I think it is very, very important for us to state not only here on the floor but to also say in our communities and the workplace that there is no greater service than making sure that your children and grandchildren have a better opportunity than what you have had. That is kind of the unwritten statement for the 30-something Working Group. We are benefactors of the generation that allowed us to have better opportunities than what they have had. I think that is what makes our

country great. I commend those Members that live with that philosophy.

But I think it is important in a time of judgment and a time that we all have to be leaders that we stand up, not only stand up, but inform the American people and future generations on what is going to happen good for them and in many cases what may not work out the way that is being portrayed here in the Congress or any issue that we are talking about here, that we are taking action on here in Washington, D.C.

There are a lot of good things that families are doing for one another to make sure that future generations and their bloodline have a better opportunity than what they have had. There are families that are trying to save money with a college plan or savings plan for their children to receive education for their bloodline for the first time. Some families that only made it after a 4-year experience stopped at an associate's degree or a bachelor's of science degree, and want their children or a family member to be able to receive a master's degree or a doctor's degree.

□ 1830

It is that individual in the middle of America that wants his or her son or daughter to be able to carry the family business further than they were ever capable to carry it. I know that it is in the fiber of our American Dream that is in our hearts and in our minds.

So when we start talking about the issue of Social Security, we have to say that that is a paramount issue when we talk about values and commitment to our future generations, we talk about value and commitment to those beneficiaries that are receiving Social Security benefits right now. We have to think about those individuals that are disabled that are counting on this Congress to stand up on their behalf, those individuals that elect us to speak on their behalf.

One thing about this body within the U.S. Congress, we cannot be appointed to the House. We cannot be appointed to this position. We have to be elected. The other body can be appointed. We have to be elected. Through the election process, there is a lot of commitment and sacrifice. A lot of Americans, someone woke up early one morning, 7 a.m., and showed up to their election polling place for some accountability. That is what we are here to do.

When we start talking about Social Security, I think it is important that we come to this floor to let the American people know and the Members of this House of Representatives know that many of us within the Congress are very, very concerned about the privatization scheme that is being talked about and that is being portrayed as a plan for future generations, or the preservation of Social Security.

We cannot believe everything we hear, especially when folks start saying, well, these are the facts and this is

my plan and this is the way it is going to work. Right now, especially on the Democratic side, and I will say a few of my Republican colleagues understand that 48 million Americans are receiving Social Security right now, that 33 million of those Americans are already retired, 33 million that are counting on Social Security. Social Security is that security blanket, our end of the deal that we said we would hold, they paid into it, it is there for them and it will be there for them for the next 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 years at the same level that it is right now.

Of course we want to strengthen Social Security. Also, it is important to understand that right now, today, \$955 per month on average goes out every month to support families and support their unmet needs. This is not a giveaway. This is what they paid for. This is what they invested in. It is important that we do not gamble with those dollars. I think it is also important to understand that 48 percent of Social Security beneficiaries, if they did not have Social Security, they would be living in poverty today.

So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but have trouble with the administration's plan and some Members on the Republican side's plan to privatize Social Security and to say and admit up front that benefits will be cut and that they would not only receive a benefit cut but even those who do not want to go in a private account will suffer.

I cannot understand for the life of me how we can serve that up on a platter and say that we are trying to help future generations or present enrollees in Social Security right now. I cannot help but question \$5 trillion. Until I got to the Congress, I had no meaning of what \$5 trillion actually meant, \$5 trillion, not of money that we have in our wallets but money that we are willing to borrow, \$5 trillion. But better yet, this is supposed to help maintain Social Security.

I am going to talk a little further about what we are doing as Democrats, but I would like to yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding. I actually want to commend him because I see him week after week on the floor leading the group under-30 as they demonstrate that you do not have to be a senior citizen, that you do not have to be old and elderly, you do not have to have been here 25 years to have impact on this body. And so I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding, but I also commend him for his leadership and for his position as he talks about Social Security, one of the great programs that has bolstered the quality of life for people in our country.

I actually grew up in a rural community in Arkansas before moving to Chicago, and we had a saying there, that if it ain't broke, don't fix it. They would oftentimes be talking about farm machinery and other kinds of things.